

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/532,851	04/27/2005	Gert Callies	10191/3820	1950
26646 . 7590 11/01/2006		EXAMINER		
KENYON & KENYON LLP			PASCHALL, MARK H	
ONE BROADWAY NEW YORK, NY 10004			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1,2,, 10141, 1			3742	

DATE MAILED: 11/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary	10/532,851	CALLIES ET AL.			
,	Examiner Made N. Baseball	Art Unit			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	Mark H. Paschall	orrespondence address			
Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim till apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	I. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 Au	igust 2006.				
	action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 10-29 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 10-29 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	n from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner	epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P	ite			
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6)				

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 10-16,18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Durheim in view of Chang et al 780'. The claims are unpatentable for the same reasons set forth on pages 2-3 in the office action dated 05-17-2006, with respect to claims 1-9.

Claims 17 and 20-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Durheim in view of Chang et al as applied to claims 10-16, 18, 19

Application/Control Number: 10/532,851

Page 3

Art Unit: 3742

above, and further in view of Richter et al (6,630,645). Durheim as modified by Chang et al teaches the claimed laser drilling system with a backing plate used against the workpiece. The claims call for a backing, which is tilted at a specific angle relative to the outlet opening of the workpiece. The patent to Richter et al is applied for teaching a laser drilling system with the angle of drilling through the work variable relative to the work. Thus the angle would also be variable relative to a stationary backing plate, as set forth in Durheim as modified. Use of a variable angle leads to more versatility in the drilling methods available to the apparatus and in view of this teaching it would have been obvious to modify the Durheim system further to include a variable angle laser Beam, to effect a more versatile method and system.

Note use of nitrogen and inert gases as the processing gases, as disclosed in the applied patents.

Conclusion

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 10-29 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Note that the claims not treated in the preliminary amendment filed, are treated above, along with newly presented claims.

Art Unit: 3742

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark H. Paschall whose telephone number is 571 272-4784. The examiner can normally be reached on 7am - 3pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robin Evans can be reached on 571-272-4777. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MHTLJUJ Mark H Paschall Primary Examiner Art Unit 3742